

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 781

JC 980 078

AUTHOR Byrne, Joseph P.
 TITLE Chairs and Change in the Evolving Community College.
 PUB DATE 1997-00-00
 NOTE 30p.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Role; College Administration; College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Department Heads; Educational Change; *Educational Trends; Leadership Qualities; Leadership Responsibility; Literature Reviews; Organizational Change; *Power Structure; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

To determine the effects of trends and social forces on community college administrative structure, a review was conducted of pertinent recent literature. Findings assert that traditionally, community colleges have had highly bureaucratic organizational structures and faculty with relatively low levels of educational achievement. However, dramatic enrollment increases due to economic changes and workforce training needs are working to undermine that bureaucratic structure as faculty develop professionally and cross-unit teams increase their presence. Community college faculty include a growing number of doctorate degree-holders, as well as more part-time faculty, trends that can be expected to increase the professional level of department chairs, who traditionally have had little training. The increasing role of faculty in college governance and the implementation of cross-division teams may encroach on the traditional power wielded by chairs. Contains 37 references. (BCY)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Chairs and Change in the Evolving Community College

Joseph P. Byrne

University of Georgia, Athens

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Byrne

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OUTLINE

I Introduction

II Community Colleges are Different

III Issues of Mid-Level Management

1. The Identity and Qualifications of the Chair
2. The Professionalization of the Faculty
3. Participatory and Team Building Trends

IV Conclusion

ABSTRACT

Based upon an examination of recent literature on community college administrative structure, and on the position of chairs in that structure, this study explores the recent trends in institutions and the society at large that are shaping the position in a multitude of ways. The apparent breakdown of the application of the bureaucratic model of structure in the face of experiments in increasing professionalization of personnel and the use of cross-unit teams may call for a new paradigm to be applied by both scholars and administrations themselves. Redefinitions of the roles of chairs may also call forth a new type of professionalized chair, one with greater preparation in both leadership and management, and in his or her academic discipline, which will allow for the ability to lead toward academic professionalization by example.

THE COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CHAIRPERSON: REFLECTIONS UPON A REVIEW
OF THE RECENT LITERATURE
by Joseph P. Byrne PhD.

Introduction

Two-year schools today take many forms, the most common being the vocational/technical school, the university 'feeder school', and the comprehensive community college. This paper explores academic departmental or divisional administration at the comprehensive community college as discussed in recent professional literature. This literature is scanty when compared with that dealing with other levels of administration, with non-academic divisions, and with four-year schools and universities, but has increased in quantity and scope over the past half dozen years.

One approach is through materials dealing with community colleges themselves. Perhaps because the upper echelons of authority are traditionally seen as the home of the movers and shakers, most of the descriptive and prescriptive studies focus on presidents and higher administrators. Chairs rarely appear, except as functionaries whose potential for obstruction or cooperation may be matters of concern.

A second approach is through the literature on mid-level management in colleges and universities in general. The classic 'encyclopediaic' work is Tucker's handbook, which indeed includes some discussion in its opening chapters of community college chairs. Unfortunately, (at least in his 1984 edition) he concludes that for the most part these chairs face the same

problems and challenges that other chairs do, and so they are merely assumed away in the ensuing substantive chapters.

Literature that deals specifically with the community college chair was a long time coming, and began to appear with some frequency only in the early 1990s. [Seagren, 5] Much of this is prescriptive, dealing with departmental or institutional reforms from the departmental level, with only one work that I have found resulting from a solid study of chairs themselves. Some earlier work relied on informal questioning or a researcher's experience with chairs, but it took the development of the National Community College Chair Academy, an effort stemming from Arizona's Maricopa district and developed in cooperation with the University of Nebraska - Lincoln, to develop and administer a useful instrument [Seagren].

This research confirms what many others have believed, and what certainly had directed scholarly attention away from department or divisional chairs. Chairs are amateurs who rise from the ranks, serve at the pleasure of the administration, and return to the ranks; consequently interest in neither their characteristics nor concerns, training nor suitability went much beyond the anecdotal and perfunctory.

This paper explores some of this research, both older and new, and seeks to place the chair in his or her proper place in the community college organization. The first section briefly outlines the structural features that distinguish community college administrations from other collegiate types, especially

as they shape the experiences and expectations of the chairs. The second section addresses three major issues that face community college chairs and those who appoint and supervise them. These issues are qualifications for chairs, opportunities and problems arising from increased professionalization of the community college faculty, and potential impacts of 'participational' or participatory trends in campus administration. What should emerge is a clearer, if more complex, picture of the chair and his relationship with the institution, administration, and faculty s/he serves.

I Community Colleges Are Different

Two-year post-secondary schools first developed in the later nineteenth century, as adjuncts to the nation's burgeoning universities. These new institutions from the beginning served the same basic functions they do today, functions that arose in the Gilded Age and Progresssive Era. On the one hand they were to help prepare young Americans and newly arrived immigrants for the urban workplace with vocational or 'industrial' training. On the other, they served as schools that augmented the often sorry offerings of public high schools in helping others prepare for coursework in the universities. Unlike other colleges or universities, or many public high schools, these were purely community-provided, with an immediate attachment to the needs and aspirations of the local constituency. Then as now they were defined by these needs and aspirations, being strongly influenced

by local rather than regional, state, disciplinary or denominational considerations.

Community colleges developed at the same time as the Weberian bureaucratic model, Taylorism, and the efficiency movement in business and government. [McGrath and Spear, 60-1] Application of fairly strict bureaucratic lines of authority and communication were practically assumed, especially since the teaching staff far more closely resembled that of high schools than universities. [cf. Birnbaum, 106] The faculties' professional obligations were defined by the imperative to teach, often in broadly disparate disciplines, and this, coupled with mandated flexibility and quick response to emerging and changing needs prevented strong disciplinary developments along strict departmental lines, and ensured a firm hand from above. Indeed, Seagren states "(r)esponse to change, perhaps more than any other single factor, differentiated two-year, post-secondary from traditional four-year higher education." [3] Chairs and divisions -- made up of several, more or less related disciplines -- emerged in many schools, at the same time as they did in normal schools, during the 1920s and 1930s. In some larger and well-developed schools departments with only two or three closely related disciplines represented were established.

Birnbaum exemplifies the 'bureaucratic' model of organizational structure with an examination of a community college, a choice easily justified by the traditional literature on community colleges. In this analysis a relatively tightly

coupled system assumes that both problems and solutions are structural in nature, respectively addressed or effected by shifting the components or altering the connections among them [121]. In such a system communication within and across levels is vital and this importance is indeed recognized by the chairs surveyed by Seagren [38]. In addition, the traditional relatively low level of academic achievement on the part of many (most) community college faculty members has often been seen as an obstacle to collegial development around a community of interests and disciplinary identity, and has retarded professionalization of self-image. The faculty member is thus 'merely' or 'exclusively' a teacher, heavily burdened with teaching responsibilities, with little interest in shaping his or her working environment beyond the classroom. Often a jack of many trades, the faculty member may well be the only representative of her discipline in the division or department, further isolating the individual. [Cohen and Brawer]

Recent trends in community college structure, however, challenge these suppositions and older realities, and may well call for the abandonment of the bureaucratic model as either prescriptive for or descriptive of these comprehensive schools. Recent explosive growth has resulted in campuses with upwards of 20,000 and 25,000 students. Several states, including California and Florida are specifically harnessing community colleges as feeder schools for their respective university systems. Recent developments in technology, and economic trends that have sent

many in the labor force back to school for retraining or intensification of training have redefined the vocational roles of many schools, and have likewise redefined the technical faculty. Public interest in programs such as GED preparation and ESL courses has intensified the commitments of many institutions to community concerns beyond strictly vocational training and transfer.

Such rapid change and radical developments seem to have refocused attention on institutional reforms that may well undermine bureaucratic forms and tendencies. As early as 1983 25% of liberal arts faculty held doctorates: the day of the glorified high school teacher was already waning. [Cohen and Brawer, 244-5] Technical instructors often lagged behind academics in status and self-perception, but increased professionalization in these fields -- especially electronics -- is helping to create the preconditions for collegiality. Nonetheless, the mix of faculty remains very uneven, with superannuated but academically underqualified teachers alongside freshly minted PhDs with one eye on their disciplines and another on the matters at hand. [Vaughn, 4-6] Another problem related to increases in the number of faculty is the use of part-time and adjunct teachers. Even less than ambitious full-time recent PhDs are these faculty attached to the institution let alone to their home disciplines. [Avakian] This can add to institutional lethargy on the one hand, and detract from real collegiality on the other. Seagren's chairs reported similar numbers for full

and part-timers, suggesting that this segment of the faculty is large and must be taken into account. [37] Differences in class, academic preparation, values, and adaptability to change may also create rifts among faculty that directly affect the chair's position. [McGrath and Spear, 24]

These complications are further deepened when one considers that many schools are simultaneously beginning experiments with team-building and various forms of participatory management that require the very attachment that professionalization may enhance, but extensive part-timer use may retard. Add to this the fact that many faculties are represented by unions with collective bargaining units [Lucas, 12], and one must admit that there are few of the 'givens' left on which earlier theorists and practitioners hung their hats.

In sum, the factors that clearly serve to complicate the traditional bureaucratic picture, and serve to complicate the chair's role in that picture include 1) collective bargaining with its uncertainties; 2) extensive use of part-time faculty that often exhibit very low attachment to the institution, department or discipline; 3) increasing experimentation with professionalization of faculty through scholarship; 4) increasing experimentation with participatory management; 5) an increasing percentage of PhDs in academic departments or divisions; 6) changing demands on the part of the communities, demands that may best be understood and addressed by the faculty or chair directly, rather than through the mediation of the

higher administration; 7) changes in the structure of student demand for courses and programs that are likely to be addressed most effectively at levels lower than the upper echelons of the administration.

II Issues of Mid-Level Management

1. The Identity and Qualifications of the Chair

Of the chairs responding to Seagren's 1992 survey 57% were chairs of "departments", while 35.7 reported being "divisional" chairs [37], suggesting that the traditional division was giving way to the more tightly integrated department. Nonetheless, unlike the typical academic department at a college or university, the community college department or division ususally consists of faculty members from a number of different disciplines, and of faculty that teach outside of their home disciplines.

Administrative tasks at this level are many and varied. In 1971 Richardson listed seven fundamental tasks, including review, revision and addition to the curriculum; evaluation of course outlines and syllabi; participation in staff selection; scheduling of classes; keeping a continuing inventory of physical property; developing educational and library media; and developing and administering the unit budget. By 1984 Tucker had expanded and refined the list of chair functions to total 59 discrete tasks subsumed under 8 general headings, including

departmental governance; instruction; faculty affairs; student affairs; external communication; budget and resources; office management; and professional development. He also indicated some 28 roles of the chair, which included teacher, advocate, entrepreneur, evaluator, and peacemaker [2-3]. A decade later Lucas suggested seven major administrative tasks for the chair: preparing teaching schedules; ensuring effectiveness of part-time and adjunct faculty; managing office staff; making personnel decisions; revising the curriculum; and managing the budget [30-1].

What was implicit in many of Tucker's "roles" became explicit in Lucas' distinction of managerial from leadership functions or roles. "Chairs must learn to be leaders and to view themselves as leaders." [47] Using a transformational as opposed to a transactional model of leadership, Lucas suggests that the chair not only manage but lead the personnel by stimulating, energizing, creating a vision, providing a climate and giving consideration. This human relations type of approach is coming to dominate the literature on the functioning chair. Seagren characterizes the chair as a juggler: "the chair effectively spans the gaps among the competing groups both on and off campus. And the chair is in the middle, feeling the pressure of the objects in flight, delicately balancing interests, and hoping that the final act will receive a standing ovation." [ix] Bennett, in his casebook companion to Tucker's handbook, notes that the chair is "(r)ooted in the faculty like no other

administrator but tied to the administration like no other faculty member..." [11] Richardson points out that the "(d)ivision chairmen represent the focal point for stress between the administrative structure and the governance structure." [176] The power of the chair (and perhaps also the dean) to create an environment for faculty activity is dramatized by Acebo: "An instructional division is a landscape experienced by its inhabitants as vast, intimate, barren, provident, open or restrictive, depending on how they are positioned within it. Of greatest significance in this positioning is the relation of the parts. Key players can construct a division that brings everyone into relation with everyone else and equidistant from the reservoirs of power, or the stakeholders can create wildernesses and backwaters without meaning to, based on familiar hierarchical models." [89]

The experts agree that the experts agree that the chair is a lynchpin position. Yet as recently as 1978 Scott could defend his omission of academic chairs from his work on mid-level college administration "...because they typically come from the faculty, [they] have not been career administrators. These officials are certainly administrators, but their status and roles set them outside the commonly accepted administrative ranks. They are viewed as amateurs...and with good reason: advertisements for these positions often say 'successful administrative experience is not a prerequisite for the position'... Charles Cherry of Villanova wrote 'conventional wisdom has it that the qualified

academic administrator is the professor who answers his mail'."

[page?]

In 1997, nationally advertised chair positions typically require five or more years of teaching experience and three or more years experience in administrative positions. Some professional materials stress the role of committee service in identifying and preparing future chairs, yet formal preparation is still sorely lacking. Graduate or post-graduate programs in administration may address some of this deficiency, but the fact is that many of these vital administrators merely emerge from the ranks of the faculty at the institution in question. Seagren's survey reveals that 65% had no previous community college administrative experience, though an equal percentage had some business or industry experience, while 30% served in some capacity in public agencies. 60% held masters degrees, while 23.6% held doctorates, and 43.5% had served in primary or secondary schools. In only 17.5% of Seagren's cases did the faculty alone choose their chair, while administrative appointments accounted for 52% and jointly arrived at decisions accounted for 29.5% of appointments. [12-28] An interesting study would survey higher administrators to determine the major factors in their decisions both in promoting from within, and hiring from the outside, when mere rotation of faculty into the chair is not the case.

The balancing of experience and academic qualifications is another matter that bears noting, especially as more PhDs enter

the ranks of the faculty. May one assume that the holder of a doctorate will respond as readily to a supervisor who holds merely an M.A. or M.S., especially if respective ages and teaching experience are similar? As the transfer function of community colleges increases, will outside influences pressure administrators to have their departments led by holders of the terminal degrees in the appropriate fields? Is an M.A. and the limited academic training it implies enough to warrant leadership of larger departments, or should one expect to see departments and divisions in community colleges broken up still further as student demand increases the need for more faculty and more varied programs within disciplines? Certainly the chair is heavily dependent upon the administrators, but it may be safe to say that the chairs are also increasingly dependent on their own faculty for their expertise, especially where a number of disparate disciplines are represented. Administrators are likely also to expect more than mere compliance from their chairs as the complexity of environmental demands require responses grounded in ever greater expertise from chairs or their faculty. If the professionalization of chairs becomes a trend, then less bureaucratic and perhaps more political types of interactions will result, as expertise and other forms of power become lodged more widely throughout the institution. This trend is likelier than one toward greater collegiality, since the latter requires attachment to the institution and its values and goals, and relative equality among its members [Birnbaum, 88-9], neither of

which is enhanced by the typical heavy reliance upon part-time faculty.

2. The Professionalization of the Faculty

McGrath and Spear trace the nonprofessional nature and perceptions of community college faculty back to the early days of two-year college growth and the influence of Taylorism, which was applied from the beginning. Goal setting and quality control were matters for the professional administrators, while the teachers were simply to carry out the assigned tasks. The teachers and administrators are assumed to be fully rational actors carrying out the tasks of planning, making choices and teaching, while matters like curriculum, scheduling, programs and budgets are mere instruments to be efficiently and effectively manipulated, rather than processes. [60-2]

The curriculum itself suffers from weakness in the status of academic courses: course repetition and the lack of upper division courses create disincentives to teacher preparation; the overwhelming presence of underprepared students suggests a weakening of standards; the transfer function can be served by a substitution of 'articulated' courses in place of true parallels to college-level courses. Both students and faculty suffer from this general degradation: "[i]ntellectual activity became debased and trivialized, reduced to skills, information, or personal expression -- for students who look to education as their chief hope of advancement." [McGrath and Spear, 53-4] The

absence or debility of an academic culture retards even the most devoted faculty from being able "to collegially shape students' styles, to form their minds." [78]

Idiosyncratic teachers, departmental sovereignty and too much attention to grades have combined to "encourage a brew of competing agendas which undermines the academic culture" of the community college. [McGrath and Spear, 85] They see the faculty as suffering from an inferiority complex, generally stuck in "flat occupational hierarchies" [139], acting as independent contractors or an aggregation of journeymen rather than as professionals [146]. "The profession of community college instructor is new, its rules unclear. ... For the faculty, institutional ambiguity translates into a role that floats somewhere between high school teacher and university professor." [139] Lack of connectedness to their disciplines has caused many to drift toward "negotiated anemic practices" [142], or a "practitioner's culture" in which the conscious link between theory and practice is broken, and immediacy and personal experience trump all other considerations. [153] Ironically, McGrath and Spear also posit that their teaching should be the "most basic communication from the faculty to the students of intellectual activity and academic life." [94]

As early as 1980 London noted the ambivalence of many faculty, more than a quarter of whom surveyed expressed a strong desire to be rather in a four-year institution. He noted that resentments, frustration and a sense of low esteem were

telegraphed to students, further undermining or preventing a jointly accepted academic culture. [cf. McGrath and Spear, 24] Many were trained in graduate programs to appreciate the value of "disinterested inquiry, scholarship, research, and the worth and efficacy of working with ideas," [London, 236] but had to abandon application of these ideals in the face of huge teaching loads, poorly prepared students and isolation from their disciplines.

Fryer argues that an institution best meets its multiple and complex goals "when significant numbers of its people exhibit high levels of personal and professional commitment to institutional purposes." [215-6] Improving the level of commitment for Fryer means creating a climate that fosters compliance and commitment by combining the best of the structural, human resource, political and symbolic frames of reference, "all in interaction with one another" [222-3], to make work meaningful. He notes that hierarchical strength and thus quick response to environmental or institutional needs are enhanced by both compliant and committed faculty, whereas weakness in these areas can lead to alienation and adverse consequences such as political action through unionization or other expressions of frustration or cynicism. [218] Indeed, "creating a positive environment" ranked at the top of the responses to Seagren's inquiries of chairs about the main tasks of chairs. The question of how to do this is increasingly being answered in terms of faculty development [McGrath & Spear, London, Smith, Cohen & Brawer, Palmer & Vaughn, Duvall]

Although Cohen and Brawer found among responding community college teachers that "as a group the instructors exhibit the tendencies of individuals practicing a craft in isolation ... They want to be left alone to ply their craft in their own individually tailored way." [256] None the less, in 1983 18% were working on higher degrees [243], and 39% claimed to desire "professional development opportunities" [248]. As early as 1987 they noted an uptrend in disciplinary participation (conferences, book reviewing, course and curricular material review), and that "when opportunities are there, the faculty will take advantage of them." [247-8]

Palmer and Vaughn in 1992 drew together a number of scholars who agree that the road to greater commitment and professionalization is paved with scholarship. The task is "to encourage and recognize faculty and administrator scholarship, making it a valued part of the community college's institutional culture." [v] It is delegated to the administrators, who need to change attitudes about scholarship at all levels, and make certain that scholarship retains a vital linkage with teaching and other professional obligations of the educators to the broader community. Vaughn specifically admits the problems -- history, the teaching imperative, the distraction of community service, the issue of part-time faculty, the problems of rewards, the inevitable complaints of lack of time -- but notes that leadership that allows appropriately broad definitions of scholarship to emerge from the affected faculty and defines

scholarship within the mission of the school will be most effective in fostering both traditional and innovative activities that go beyond the usual classroom experience, yet enhance it. Palmer, who surveyed 840 faculty at 101 community colleges, found that 73% of full-time and 72% of part-time faculty agree that their scholarship to date (however defined) had helped their teaching effectiveness. Interestingly, at about the same time that over 90% of Seagren's chairs agreed that "encouraging professional development of staff" was one of their main tasks [59], only 37% of Palmer's full-time and 25% of his part-time faculty who had produced 'scholarship' reported having received help from their chairs. [59] Duvall, having studied the role of the dean, concludes that "[t]he instructional dean can play the most influential role in creating a climate that supports and encourages faculty scholarship. Deans, while they are clearly administrators, are also faculty members, concerned with the curriculum, teaching methods, and classroom management. Through their efforts, faculty and the institution as a whole can explore and revise their notions of teaching, scholarship and the relationship between the two." [19] Of Palmer's full-time instructors, 33% reported support from the dean for their scholarship, while a measely 12% of part-timers did so. [59] This discrepancy may suggest a serious inattention by the higher administrators to these important members of the academic community, who already tend to suffer from alienation and lack of committment.

While the dean received attention in Palmer and Vaughn's collection, chairs were virtually ignored. Nonetheless, Palmer insists that "[c]ollege efforts to encourage scholarship should be structured at the department level, with input from the chairs and faculty." [64] A new emphasis on scholarship as a means of promoting professionalization clearly has implications for chairs as both managers and leaders. As managers they should be key in defining and articulating the role of scholarship or other professional development in the mix of duties and responsibilities of their faculty, especially as regards rewards and other burdens such as committee and teaching assignments. Palmer, Vaughn and Duvall agree that scholarship should not be coerced from faculty, and that while it should be a part of the evaluation process and rewarded, it should not be mandated. Defining and applying new guidelines, and dealing with their consequences may be a major role and challenge for the transformational leader who is emerging in the place of the traditional chair. Palmer and Vaughn also indicate the need for leadership by example, which may suggest that the chairs need to be active scholars themselves, adding weight to the idea that PhDs may need to succeed the older M.A.s. Creativity, sensitivity, and persistence in faculty development may well come to stand stand beside efficiency in scheduling, budgeting and curricular development in the effective chair's repertoire. The chair's willingness and ability to judge the appropriateness and value of extracurricular contributions in various disciplines

with which he or she is only passingly familiar may also become an important qualification.

Of course, new attention to and encouragement of scholarship will also have an impact on each of the institution's departmental or divisional faculties, as the presumably younger and perhaps more highly trained members vie for the rewards [Palmer, 54-6], while older, more experienced teachers remain wedded to their routines in classrooms and on committees, which, after all, had always been the norm. Bennett notes that new chairs have to make three major adjustments in taking over -- moving from specialist to generalist, individualist to running a collective, and from loyalty to discipline to loyalty to the institution [3]: what additional adjustments must older faculty/new chairs make as transformational leaders, and might recent PhDs, perhaps with an eye on advancing into coveted four-year positions take advantage of institutional incentives to the detriment of the traditional mission of the unit and school; or at the very least make incomplete adjustments?

Professionalization of the faculty could also contribute to a more grassroots revolution of rising expectations. Cohen and Brawer claimed that "instructors tend to be uncomfortable with the structure, bureaucracy, and layers of authority in their institutions. They have little control over anything outside of their classrooms." [257] If professionalization moves on apace, and the institutions themselves do not adjust their structures to allow for a larger faculty role in institutional affairs, then

this discomfort can only increase. In fact, another trend, toward greater participation by faculty in governance, may well address potential imbalance.

3. Participatory and Team-building Trends

Twenty-five years ago Richardson, Blocker and Bender discussed the problems and opportunities associated with participational governance. They pointed out that only in loosely coupled relations, rather than hierarchical, bureaucratic ones, could faculty have considerable autonomy with which to carry out their teaching and other functions. [176] They located in the mid-level management the focal point for stresses resulting from a shift "from an authoritarian to a participational structure of governance." [156] As with later literature on transformational leadership, Richardson et al. emphasize leadership by example, rather than achieving compliance through pushing personnel.

Expanding the governance role of faculty is a theme found in many recent studies [Cohen & Brawer, Fryer, Baker and associates] Baker's authors explore team building within units, an approach that affects the institutional operations from the ground up, while the other authors concentrate on cross-unit teams. Rosemary Gillette-Karam, writing in Baker, finds that intra-unit team building creates shared responsibilities that channel energies and create commitment to change; align interpersonal purposes; allow for greater communication; focus attention on the

future, enhancing planning functions; focus attention on tasks, and enhance both creative talents and rapid response to changes in the environment. [164] In the same work Lester Reed attributes this trend to the drying up of resources, and thus greater competition for them, in the 1980s. For Fryer, cross-unit team building is a way to enhance the tightness of the structure by eliciting commitment rather than merely achieving compliance. [216] He also found that faculty tend to report lower levels of actual participation than administrators do, and attributes this to the fact that faculty representatives actually handle a great deal of bottom up business.

Initiatives like writing across the curriculum, that may deeply affect the structure of courses, place greater demands on teachers and thus create new sources of friction between faculty and chairs may properly be the products of carefully considered team decisions, but the implications for community college administration are clear. First, such participational teams need to be clearly placed in the structure of the institution. This is especially the case if they have the authority to implement, oversee and revise their initiatives, all of which Reed insists are essential features. [127] In the areas delegated to such teams, both lower-level chairs and higher-level administrators -- assuming that they deal with the teams in good faith -- stand to lose a great deal of both authority and power, and the traditional hierarchy will be shaken with each new application of the approach.

For some, this is a consumation devoutly to be wished. In any case, however, it will require a new type of paradigm. As discussed above, collegiality as a foundation for relationships across levels can hardly develop with such a strong presence of part-timers. A political model may accurately depict some features of this new situation, but nodes of resource and power are likely to be continually shifting, making the requisite exchanges difficult to predict and carry out. Organized anarchy may well result as certain realms of decision-making and implementation are drained from administrators and shifting groups of faculty and staff absorb new functions. In the absence of an effectively collegial environment, charismatic leaders may emerge from among the faculty and staff, further complicating the distinctions between the table of organization and the realities of governance and decision-making.

The impacts of all of this on chairs is highly ambiguous, as elements of their personal and expert power come to the fore in lieu of traditional reliance on positional power. [cf. Lucas, 10-19; Tucker, 7 ff.] Any of the basic sources of the chair's power, as perceived by Tucker, may be strengthened or weakened by the ways in which these teams are created, constituted and charged. Tucker noted that this power traditionally stemmed from influence or control over committee assignments, curriculum, scheduling, resources, external communication, promotion and tenure, faculty evaluation, salaries, and roles in defending the department. One can easily imagine the development of teams that

encroach on each of these prerogatives.

Conclusion

Recent literature on the changes overtaking community colleges points to potentially profound effects on the functions and authority of the academic unit chairs. Professionalization and team building present elements that may either or both threaten or enhance the effectiveness of the chair, and yet stem directly from initiatives of the higher administration. It is also the administration that defines the qualities and qualifications of most chairs, and the importance of these definitions becomes clearer as the roles of the position are seen to be shifting. It would seem that however administrations seek to respond to external and internal pressures for change, the implications for both pathways and structures of governance are as profound as any that the two-year institution has seen since its inception a century ago. In all of this, the chair sits in the linchpin position, at the interface of students, faculty and administration, playing what promises to be an increasingly ambiguous role in the absence of clear definitions of power and authority from the higher powers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acebo, Sandra. 1995. "The Academic Team: A Case Study of Shared Governance". In George A. Baker, et al. *Team Building for Quality. Transitions in the American Community College*. Washington, D.C.: A.A.C.C.; pp. 79-92.
- Alfred, Richard; Elsner, Paul; LeCroy, Jan, eds. 1984. *Emerging Roles for College Leaders*. New Directions for Community Colleges, #46. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. [ERIC ED 245 773]
- Avakian, A. Nancy. 1995. "Conflicting Demands for Adjunct Faculty." *Community College Journal*, June/Jul, 34-36.
- Bennett, John B. 1983. *Managing the Academic Department: Cases and Notes*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Bila, Dennis W. 1983. "The Strategy of Internal Communications and Working Relations." In *Strategic Management in the Community College*, G.A. Myran, ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 37-50
- Birnbaum, Robert. 1988. *How Colleges Work: The Cybernetics of Academic Organization and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Blocker, Clyde E., and Koehnline, William A. 1970. "The Division Chairman in the Community College." *Junior College Journal* 40:2, 9-12.
- Boggs, G.R. 1983. "Faculty Evaluation." *Community College Review*, 11:2, 34-41
- Brann, J. and Emmett, eds. 1972. *The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role*. Detroit: Balamp.
- Cohen, A.M., and Brawer, F.B. 1992. "Faculty Roles in Shaping the Curriculum." Reprinted in *ASHE Reader on Community Colleges*, Needham Heights, Mass.: Ginn; 240-259.
- _____. *Managing Community Colleges*. 1994. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Duvall, Betty. 1992. "Scholarship and the Academic Dean." In James C. Palmer and George B. Vaughn, eds., *Fostering a Climate for Faculty Scholarship at Community Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: A.A.C.J.C.; pp.17-23.
- Fryer, Thomas W. 1989. "Governance in the High-Achieving Community College." In *Innovation in the Community College*, Terry Obanion, ed. New York: Macmillan; 215-243.

- Giovannini, Eugene V., and Vogler, Daniel E. 1993. "Existing Status of *Building Communities*' Recommendations: A Dean and Chairperson Comparison." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 17, 403-413.
- Groner, Norman E. 1978. "Leadership Situations in Academic Departments: Relations among Measures of Situational Favorableness and Control." *Research in Higher Education* 8, 125-143.
- Hammons, James, and Hunter, Walter. 1977. "The Perceived Problems of Community College Chairpersons as Revealed by the Nominal Group Process." *Community/Junior College Research Quarterly* 1, 163-170.
- Hammons, James, and Thomas, Wanda. 1980. "Performance Appraisal of Community College Department/Division Chairpersons." *Community College Review*, 7:3, 41-49.
- Henry, T.C., and Creswell, J.W. 1983. "The Levels of Decision-Making in Multi-Unit Community College Systems." *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice* 7, 115-130.
- Higginbottom, George, and Romano, Richard M., eds. 1995. *Curriculum Models for General Education*. New Directions for Community Colleges, #92. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hoyt, Donald P., and Spangler, Ronald K. 1977. *Academic Effectiveness of the Academic Department Head*. 3 parts. Manhattan, Kansas: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Kintzer, F. "Organization and Leadership of Two-year Colleges." [ERIC ED 241 093]
- Lombardi, John. 1974. "The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairman in Community Colleges." Topical Paper #39. Los Angeles: Eric Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. [ERIC ED 089 811]
- London, Howard B. 1992 "In Between: The Community College Teachers." Reprinted in *ASHE Reader on Community Colleges*, Needham Heights, Mass.: Ginn; 233-239.
- Lucas, Ann F. 1994. *Strengthening Departmental Leadership: A Team-Building Guide for Chairs in Colleges and Universities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McGee, Richard L. 1995. "Faculty Evaluation Procedures in 11 Western Community Colleges." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 19, 341-348.

- McGrath, Dennis, and Spear, Martin B., eds. 1991. *The Academic Crisis of the Community College*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- O'Grady, James P. jr. 1971. "The Role of the Departmental Chairman." *Junior College Journal* 42:2, 35-6.
- Palmer, James C. 1992. "The Scholarly Activity of Community College Faculty: Findings of a National Survey." In Palmer and George B. Vaughn, eds. *Fostering a Climate for Faculty Scholarship at Community Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: A.A.C.J.C.; pp. 49-66.
- Pierce, Harmon B. 1971. "The Role of the Science Division Chairmen in Regionally Accredited Two-Year Colleges: A National Survey." *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 8, 251-254.
- Richardson, Richard C.; Blocker, Clyde; Bender, Louis W. 1971. *Governance for the Two-Year College*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Roueche, John E., and Barton, Thomas E. 1985. "Leadership and the Curriculum." In *Leadership Strategies for Community College Effectiveness*, Dale F. Campbell, et al., eds. Washington, D.C.: A.A.C.J.C.; 40-53.
- Scott, Robert L. 1978. *Lords, Squires and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle Managers and their Organizations*. AAHE-ERIC Clearinghouse Report #7.
- Seagren, Alan T., et al. 1994. *Academic Leadership in Community Colleges*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Shawl, W.F. 1974. "The Role of the Academic Dean." Topical Paper #42. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. [ERIC ED 092 210]
- Smith, Al. 1989. "Innovations in Staff Development." In *Innovation in the Community College*. New York: MacMillan; 177-199.
- Tucker, Allan. 1984. *Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership among Peers*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Vaughn, George B. 1992. "Scholarship and the Culture of the Community College." In James C. Palmer and Vaughn, eds., *Fostering a Climate for Faculty Scholarship at Community Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: A.A.C.J.C.; pp. 1-10.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE